

RECEIVED

0098

SEP 0 5 2001

550686

5 MR. McCULLUM: Thank you. My name is Rod
6 McCullum. I'm a nuclear engineer. I work for the
7 Nuclear Energy Institute, trade association that
8 represents the owners and operators of the 103 nuclear
9 plants in 31 states. We also represent a number of
10 other businesses, about 249 members in total in the
11 medical research, the scientific materials, science
12 research communities.

13 We generate 20 percent of the nation's
14 electricity. We do so without emitting harmful air
15 pollutants or greenhouse gases. The scientific
16 benefits of nuclear science are also quite extensive.
17 We contribute significantly to the protection of our
18 environment, and we contribute significantly to the
19 quality of life in this country. We're proud of what
20 we do. We're proud of our safety record. Those 103
21 nuclear power plants --

22 (APPLAUSE)

23 -- are embraced by the communities in which
24 they are. They are --

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What about Three Mile

0099

1 Island?

2 MR. McCULLUM: Even in Three Mile Island.

550686

3 They are assets to those communities. Those

4 communities want them to stay. They want them to

5 continue to generate power, they want them to be able

6 to move their waste to a safe, permanent disposal site.

7 I've talked to nuclear plant workers who used to work

8 at other types of power plants and changed jobs because

9 of a cleaner, safer working conditions at nuclear power

10 plants.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're a PR man from

12 the industry.

13 MR. McCULLUM: I am a nuclear engineer. I'm

14 the technical person from the industry.

15 MODERATOR LAWSON: Just give the

16 presentation.

17 MR. McCULLUM: Sorry.

18 MODERATOR LAWSON: Look --

19 MR. McCULLUM: Over this comment period

20 that's been open since May 7th, we've reviewed the

21 scientific documentation that DOE has produced. We've

22 seen it discussed in numerous public scientific

23 meetings. We've seen the science debated. We conclude

24 from all this review that this is a convincing case.

550686

25 That Yucca Mountain is capable of protecting public

0100

1 health and safety. Science is credible. Science was

2 conducted by thousands of scientists over a 20-year

3 period. From all six national laboratories, and from

4 the U.S. Geologic Service. These are the most credible

5 minds we have. They are the best minds we have.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: From the tobacco

7 industry.

8 MR. McCULLUM: They are independent

9 scientists, and they have done this work at a cost of

10 \$4 billion, 7 billion on the total program, including

11 the other sites that were studied.

12 The DOE science we find is conservative.

13 We've had our own independence sciences from the

14 Electric Power Research Institute do their own studies.

15 They show that Yucca Mountain will perform even better

16 than DOE's studies. And finally, we believe it because

17 we look at the natural analog data. If you look at

18 Egyptian pyramids, cave paintings in Europe, pack rat

19 mittens in your own desert out here and other things

20 that exist in nature and, of course, the natural

550686

21 reactor in Africa, you find in fact that this is
22 credible. That we are not just making up the future.
23 DOE's predictions about the future have credibility
24 because we can observe the past. We see things can
25 survive without the protections they will have at Yucca
0101

1 Mountain in less favorable venues that they
2 radionuclides do not move through the geology. All
3 this comes out to radiation levels of equivalent to
4 what you would get in a year from eating 20 bananas, or
5 from flying from Los Angeles to Las Vegas.

6 The same political leaders who are
7 discouraging Yucca Mountain because of the risk this
8 level of radiation might pose encourage a lot of people
9 to fly from Los Angeles to Las Vegas, to bring the
10 tourist dollars here. One thing we also know point
11 about is fuel transportation. We know it's safe. We
12 have a record in this country of over 3,000 shipments
13 over 1.7 million miles of safety. We have also a much
14 more extensive basis of experience overseas. In
15 France -- where they reprocess use nuclear fuel
16 routinely, the reprocessing of this material
17 requires --

18 MODERATOR LAWSON: Excuse me, sir, just hold

550686

19 off a minute. I'm not going to take any more

20 outbursts. I want to get through this meeting. I am

21 starting to lose my temper. Let him finish. I don't

22 want any heckling of other people from the other side

23 either. Go ahead.

24 MR. McCULLUM: In France, the material is

25 routinely transported across the countryside. It's the

0102

1 most heavily nuclear dependent country. It has some of

2 the cleanest air in the world as well, yet because they

3 reprocess, they transport it. Yet the French

4 countryside is prime tourist territory. It's also

5 prime wine country. You buy wine there, people go on

6 vacation there. And it has not been hurt one bit by

7 the fact that every day the same material is being

8 shipped by road and rail through that French

9 countryside.

10 MODERATOR LAWSON: 30 seconds.

11 MR. McCULLUM: To wrap it up, Nevada also

12 could benefit, jobs, and diversity of the economy.

13 Your tourist industry will not suffer. That is a myth.

14 The government has an obligation to move this stuff.

550686

15 That obligation is past, present and future. All these
16 nuclear plants, facilities and the defense complex was
17 built on the understanding the government would take
18 care of this stuff. The present consumers across the
19 country pay \$17 billion for effective disposal. And
20 the future, what this is really about, future
21 generations. It's why I can stand here, because even
22 as not a Nevadan, my children or grandchildren might
23 be. It's about all our children and what type of world
24 we want them to inherit. Do we want them to inherit a
25 world with clean air, plentiful energy, a world where

0103

1 society behaves responsibly?

2 Yucca Mountain is the right thing to do. It
3 is the responsible thing to do. The Secretary and the
4 science has shown us it can be safe. We have the
5 regulatory process to keep it that way throughout the
6 future. The Secretary of Energy should recommend the
7 Yucca Mountain Site. Thank you.